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STUDY AREA AND TARGET

Muddy Fm
~4500 ft deep
~30 ft thick
BOUNDARY AND GUIDED WAVES

• Rayleigh wave
  – A surface wave

• Lamb wave
  – A Rayleigh wave guided in a layer

• Scholte wave
  – A boundary wave guided along a liquid–solid interface
  – A tube wave

• Stoneley wave
  – A boundary wave guided along a solid–solid interface
  – Has a large amplitude
  – Leaky Rayleigh wave

Note:
- Rayleigh wave propagates at a vacuum–solid interface
- Stoneley wave propagates at a solid–solid interface.
- Scholte wave propagates at a liquid–solid interface.

Sources:
http://www.geo.mtu.edu/UPSseis/rayleigh_web.jpg
Muravin.com
Wikipedia.org
K-WAVE (1962)

K-Waves in Two Intersecting Fractures

https://www1.ethz.ch/rockphysics/research/krauklis

**K-WAVE CONCEPT**

Simplified K-wave system illustration showing two well pairs (one “source” well and two “receiver” wells) (image courtesy of Seismos, Inc.).

- Question: If K-waves travel in liquid-filled fractures, how does it work in a clastic reservoir that is not fractured?

- Answer: All guided waves that propagate laterally through the reservoir are monitored.
  - Includes Stoneley, Sholte, Lamb, etc., that travel in the waveguide (the reservoir), and K-waves.
  - In the enhanced oil recovery (EOR) application, an engineering approximation is used... a mix of guided waves, including K-waves.
K-wave ray paths monitored in a hypothetical well pattern (image courtesy of Seismos, Inc.).

Idealized CO\textsubscript{2} saturation evolution generated by the K-wave system (image courtesy of Seismos, Inc.).
K-WAVE STUDY AREA

• Project plan
  – Up to 30 wells with passive surface hardware
  – Perform ~four formal data collections
  – Acquire two small 3-D surface seismic surveys
    ♦ Before: summer 2017
    ♦ After: summer 2018
  – Analyze and report
TASK BREAKDOWN

• Task 1 – Project Management
  – Planning, Oversight, Reporting

• Task 2 – Field Data Collection
  – 2.1 Prestudy 3-D survey –
    ♦ Timestamp image of CO₂ and pressure before K-wave monitoring
  – 2.2 K-Wave Monitoring –
    ♦ Baseline and three periodic monitoring surveys
  – 2.3 Poststudy 3-D survey –
    ♦ Timestamp image of CO₂ saturation after K-wave monitoring.

• Task 3 – Data Analysis and Workflow
  – 3.1 Seismic Data Interpretation and Geologic Model Refinement
  – 3.2 Predictive Simulations and Comparisons to K-Wave Surveillance
  – 3.3 Review of Results, Integration Workflow Development, and Report Generation
    ♦ Develop a workflow that integrates the K-Wave data with 4-D seismic and dynamic simulations

Proposed Field Plan
DATA ANALYSIS: 3-D AND 4-D SEISMIC

• Task 3.1 – Seismic Data Interpretation and Geologic Model Refinement
  – 3-Ds – before and after K-wave.
  – 4-D images of CO₂. Compare to the K-wave results.
  – Calibrate where there was injection prior to the K-wave survey.
  – Improve the geologic model – input for dynamic reservoir modeling with CMG software.
DATA ANALYSIS: PREDICTIVE SIMULATIONS

• Task 3.2 – Predictive Simulations and Compare to K-Wave Results
  – Refine the geologic model
  – History match to known production and CO₂ injection volumes
  – Model CO₂ saturation
  – Compare to K-wave images
DATA ANALYSIS: WORKFLOW DEVELOPMENT

• Task 3.3 – Review and Integrate Workflow
  – Develop a workflow to integrate the K-wave data with 4-D seismic and dynamic simulations.
  – Look-ahead – integrate the K-wave system into an intelligent monitoring system.
  – Leverage efforts that are currently being developed in a separate project.
K-WAVE WELL SENSORS
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INJECTOR SETUP

Source actuation is powered by compressed nitrogen. The injector operates at \(~1400\) psi, so a 100-ms release of \(\text{CO}_2\) from the well induces the pulse in the well.
TEST SHOT

- Ch 1 and Ch 2 show a test shot showing tube wave returns, displayed with different gains.
- Ch 3 is the source impulse.
- Note the tube wave returns have alternating opposite polarity and attenuate to the noise level after five or six reflections.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

• Kickoff meeting with DOE completed.
• Contracts are in place with partners: Denbury, Seismos, and CMG.
• Field reconnaissance trip with Seismos and Denbury engineers; instrumenting of three wells and acquiring test shots were completed.
• Main study area, wells to be instrumented and project time line are firmed up.
• Attachment points for sensors and source to wellheads are engineered.
• Modeling of guided wave energy in the Bell Creek reservoir is under way.
• Design, permitting, and contracting for both prestudy and poststudy surface 3-D surveys are under way.
LESSONS LEARNED

• Buildout plan for Phase 5 has well spacing twice the distance as previous phases.
  – A new, stronger “positive displacement” source has been developed, but has not yet been tested in the field.
  – Unknown if the source signal can be detected at the new distances.
  – Modeling is under way which will provide an indication.
  – A second field test will be scheduled based on modeling results.

• Field test showed that production wells operate at significantly lower pressure than injection wells.
  – If CO₂ has broken through at the well, a gas bubble may form at the top of the wellhead.
  – Bubbles interfere with the receiver signal.
  – Receivers need to be lower on the flow line.
SYNERGY OPPORTUNITIES

• Geologic and simulation models used for SASSA (scalable, automated, semipermanent seismic array) can be extended into the K-wave study area.

• Reservoir characterization data gained from other Bell Creek projects can be input to the K-wave modeling.

• Colorado School of Mines project, Charged Wellbore Casing–Controlled Source Electromagnetics (CWC–CSEM) on Reservoir Imaging and Monitoring.
  – Same Phase 5 study area for K-wave.
  – Reservoir characterization information can be shared.
  – Results of the K-wave monitoring 4-D surface seismic results can also help validate the CWC–CSEM method.

• A joint inversion project that uses the 3-D surface seismic and CSEM data together is a future possibility.
The EERC and its project partners will deploy and validate a prototype MVA (monitoring, verification, and accounting) technology in an operational carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) field environment.

- Employs a new subsurface signal, the K-wave, and other guided waves in novel approach.
- 3-year project, with ~15 months of data collection at Bell Creek Field.
  - Up to 1 year of K-wave monitoring involving up to 30 wells.
  - Validation by two surface 3-D surveys – before and after K-wave monitoring.
- Raise the technology from the current TRL 4 to TRL 7.
- The implementation is entirely surface-based and is not invasive or disruptive to operations.
- May be suitable for long-term or permanent placement.
- Expected to provide temporal and spatial monitoring of the CO₂ distribution within the reservoir.
- Could eventually be cost-effective for monitoring future CO₂ storage facilities and incorporated into an intelligent monitoring system.
- A “go/no go” decision point for project continuation: determine viability after the baseline and first monitor survey.
- Contracts in place – field recon complete – modeling in progress – first 3-D pending.
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PROGRAM GOALS ADDRESSED

1. Deploy and validate a prototype CCUS MVA technology in an operational field environment.
2. Employ a new subsurface signal.
3. Raise the current TRL 4 to TRL 7.
4. Implementation is not invasive or disruptive to operations.
5. May be suitable for long-term deployment or permanent placement.
6. Provides temporal and spatial monitoring of the CO2 distribution within the reservoir.
7. Could eventually be cost-effective for monitoring future CO2 storage facilities and incorporated into an intelligent monitoring system.

BENEFITS STATEMENT

The project will address Area of Interest 1, “Field Demonstration of MVA Technologies,” by deploying and validating a prototype carbon storage monitoring, verification, and accounting (MVA) technology in an operational field environment. The method employs a new subsurface signal, the K-wave, to monitor the migration of injected CO2 in a cost-effective, noninvasive way that is not disruptive to injection operations. Project goals will be accomplished by applying the technology, currently at TRL4, to an appropriately scaled subset of wells within a commercial-scale CO2 enhanced oil recovery project with associated CO2 storage and validating the resulting data with conventional seismic monitoring methods and dynamic reservoir simulation results, bringing the K-wave technology to TRL7. Potential exists for future upgrades to real-time monitoring that could feed data to an intelligent monitoring system. The proposed research supports the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Carbon Storage Program’s goal to “Develop and validate technologies to ensure 99 percent storage permanence.” Other DOE program goals supported by the proposed research include “develop technologies to improve reservoir storage efficiency while ensuring containment effectiveness” and “support industry’s ability to predict CO2 storage capacity in geologic formations to within ±30 percent.” Information produced will be useful for inclusion in DOE’s Carbon Storage best practices manuals for MVA, the development of which is also a DOE program goal.
PROJECT OVERVIEW – GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Ties to program goals noted in blue

- Objectives: Deploy to demonstrate, validate, and evaluate a new method of monitoring the morphology and extent of subsurface CO₂ injection plumes from the surface in a manner that has low impact, is noninvasive, and is nondisruptive to normal operations.
  - The method leverages a new way of transmitting energy from the surface to the reservoir and employs a new subsurface signal called the Krauklis wave (K-wave) and other guided wave energy for injection monitoring that may be applicable to other CCS and CCUS applications.
  - Currently at a TRL of 4 (basic technology components integrated and validated in a laboratory environment), the first-year objective is to install the system to a significant subset of a field’s wells and acquire a baseline data set and one or more major repeat/monitor data sets to evaluate the system for viability.

  ♦ A go/no-go assessment will occur after the first monitoring data are acquired to assess the likelihood of success before proceeding with the remainder of the project.

  - Assuming viability, the objective of the project will be to validate and evaluate the method as a temporal and spatial MVA method for CCS and CCUS applications as a fully integrated prototype technology tested at a field site, thus advancing the technology to TRL7 (system prototype validated in an operational system).
### Task 1.0 – Project Management, Planning, and Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>5/31/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1.1 – Project Management and Planning**
  - 10/1/16 5/31/20

- **1.2 – Project Reporting**
  - 10/1/16 5/31/20

### Task 2.0 – Field Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/16</td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2.1 – Prestudy 3-D Survey Planning, Acquisition, and Processing**
  - 12/1/16 12/31/17

- **2.2 – K-Wave Monitoring: Installation, Calibration, Baseline, and Surveillance**
  - 1/2/17 1/31/19

- **2.3 – Poststudy 3-D Survey Planning, Acquisition, and Processing**
  - 6/1/18 6/30/19

### Task 3.0 – Data Analysis and Workflow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/1/17</td>
<td>5/31/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **3.1 – Seismic Data Analysis and Geologic Model Refinement**
  - 12/1/17 10/31/19

- **3.2 – Predictive Simulations and Comparisons to K-Wave Surveillance**
  - 6/1/18 10/31/19

- **3.3 – Review of Results, Integration Workflow Development, and Report Generation**
  - 6/1/19 5/31/20

### Deliverables

- **D1** – Project Management Plan (updated)
- **D2** – Technology Maturation Plan (updated)
- **D3** – Data Management Plan (updated)
- **D4** – Data Submitted to NETL EDX

### Key for Milestones (M)

- **M1** – Formal Kickoff Meeting Held
- **M2** – Prestudy 3-D Survey Planning Initiated
- **M3** – K-Wave Surveillance Initiated
- **M4** – Poststudy 3-D Survey Planning Initiated
- **M5** – K-Wave Surveillance Completed
- **M6** – Field Data Collection and Processing Completed
- **M7** – Seismic Data Analysis Completed
- **M8** – Integration Workflow Completed

Note: Critical path passes through sub-subtasks.
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Disclaimer

This presentation was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.
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